

REMARKS

The examiner objected to the drawings.

Figure 2 has been amended to replace the solid center lines with dashed center lines as the examiner required. Replacement sheets are attached.

The claim objections listed by the examiner have all been addressed.

The 112 rejections have been addressed.

The word “vehicle” in claims 1, has been changed to “motorcycle”.

The word “vehicle” did not appear in claim 2 so the examiner’s rejection is not founded.

The word “handlebars” has been changed to “handlebar” in claim 3 lines 11, 13 and 14. There is an antecedent basis for “handlebar” on line 5 of claim 3.

The word “clamps” has been changed to “clamp” in lines 12-14 of claim 3. The antecedent basis is found in the preamble.

The word “forks” has been changed to “fork” in lines 12 and 13 of claim 3. The antecedent basis is found in line 2 of claim 3.

The examiner rejected claim 3 as being anticipated by Rocket.

The applicant has amended claim 3 to more particularly point out that the handlebars are “L” shaped with a round tube vertical column whereas the handlebars in Rocket do not have this shape but have a bicycle style with a “T” shape having a central column and a cross piece at the top to provide both the left and right handgrips.

Therefore the claims particularly as amended have different claim elements and claim 3 is therefore allowable over Rocket.

The examiner rejected claim 1 over Bontrager in view of Two Brothers.

The claims have been amended to include the split in the split rings being parallel to each other. This feature is not found in Bontrager or in Two Brothers. The splits in the split

ring being parallel allow for the adjustments to be made easily with tools used at the same angle. Since the space is limited on the motorcycle assembly it is important to have this easy access for making adjustments to the independently adjustable rings without loosening the other ring.

Since the prior art cited does not have this feature the claims as amended are believed to be allowable. For example the gaps in the split rings are not parallel in Bontrager as shown in Fig. 6.

The examiner rejected claim 2 as being obvious over Bontrager in view of Two Brothers.

With claim 1 allowable claim 2 which is dependent is also allowable.

Further, none of the prior art cited shows an L shaped handlebar as now claimed in claim 2. Therefore claim 2 is believed to be allowable.

The examiner rejected claim 3 as being obvious over Bontrager in view of Two Brothers.

The claims have been amended to recite the L shaped handlebars which is a feature not found in the prior art.

The examiner rejected claims 1 as being obvious over Rocket in view of Two Brothers.

The split ring in Rocket is collinear with the second split ring whereas the split rings in the claims are independent split rings. Therefore the elements are different and claim 1 is allowable.

The examiner rejected claims 2 as being obvious over Rocket in view of Two Brothers.

The handlebars in claim 2 are L shaped which is different from the handlebar in Rocket which is T shaped and the handlebar in Two brothers which is straight.

Therefore claim 2 is allowable.

New claim 4 introduces the split rings as being parallel and non collinear which is different from Rocket which has a collinear split entering both rings. The rings are not separately adjustable.

All claims are now believed to be in a condition for allowance.